

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 9-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends Claims 9, 12, and 16 and cancels Claims 19-27.

Claims 19-27 have been canceled because these claims are directed to a non-elected invention. Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application in order to pursue prosecution of non-elected Claims 19-27.

The drawings were objected to for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Particularly, the Examiner alleged that the "spiral coil" recited in Applicant's Claim 18 must be shown in the drawings or canceled from the claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Fig. 1 of Applicant's originally filed drawings shows the spiral coil in an exploded view and Fig. 3 of Applicant's originally filed drawings shows the spiral coil L from above. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the originally filed drawings clearly show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, including the "spiral coil." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended Claim 16 to correct the alleged informality noted by the Examiner. Support for the feature recited in Claim 16, as amended, is found, for example, in the first and second paragraphs on page 15 of Applicant's originally filed Substitute Specification.

Claims 9-12, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ibata et al. (U.S. 6,169,470). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibata et al. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibata et al. in view of Kobayashi (U.S. 6,229,425). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibata et al. in view of Konoue et al. (U.S. 2004/0084131). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 9-18.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite:

A laminated ceramic electronic component comprising:

- a ceramic laminated member;
- an inner conductor provided inside of the ceramic laminated member;
- an outer electrode provided on the surface of the ceramic laminated member; and
- a lead conductor connecting the inner conductor to the outer electrode; wherein
 - a thickness of the lead conductor is less than a thickness of the inner conductor; and
 - the lead conductor is defined by a plurality of lead conductor layers that overlap and are in contact with each other.** (emphasis added)

The Examiner alleged that Ibata et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 9, including a ceramic laminated member 3, an inner conductor 5 provided inside of the ceramic laminated member 3, an outer electrode 11 provided on the surface of the ceramic laminated member 3, and a lead conductor 7 connecting the inner conductor 5 to the outer electrode 1, wherein a thickness of the lead conductor 7 is less than a thickness of the inner conductor 5.

Applicant's Claim 9 has been amended to recite the feature of "the lead conductor is defined by a plurality of lead conductor layers that overlap and are in contact with each other." Support for this feature is found, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of Applicant's originally filed Substitute Specification, in Figs. 8-15 of Applicant's originally filed drawings, and in Applicant's originally filed Claim 12.

With respect to Applicant's originally filed Claim 12, the Examiner alleged that "the lead conductor 7 [of Ibata et al.] includes a plurality of lead conductor patterns (top lead conductor pattern layer 7 and bottom lead conductor pattern layer 6." However, as clearly shown in Figs. 1, 6, 7, and 9-14 of Ibata et al., the top lead conductor pattern layer 7 and the bottom lead conductor pattern layer 6 are disposed (1) in an upper portion and a lower portion of the ceramic laminated block and (2) on opposite sides of the ceramic laminated block 3, i.e., the upper left side and the lower right side of the ceramic laminated block 3 of Ibata et al., and as such, are and must be spaced apart from one another. In other words, the top lead conductor pattern layer 7 and the bottom

lead conductor pattern layer 6 of Ibata et al., which the Examiner alleged correspond to the plurality of lead conductor layers recited in Applicant's originally filed Claim 12, are not and cannot possibly be in contact with each other.

Thus, Ibata et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the lead conductor is defined by a plurality of lead conductor layers that overlap and are in contact with each other" as recited in Applicant's Claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ibata et al.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the top and bottom lead conductor layers 7 and 6 of Ibata et al. so as to be in contact with each other because such an arrangement would short-circuit the coil component of Ibata et al., thus, making it unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

The Examiner is reminded that if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) and MPEP § 2143.01.

The Examiner relied upon Kobayashi and Konoue et al. to allegedly cure deficiencies of Ibata et al. However, Kobayashi and Konoue et al. fail to teach or suggest the feature of "the lead conductor is defined by a plurality of lead conductor layers that overlap and are in contact with each other" as recited in Applicant's Claim 9. Thus, Kobayashi and Konoue et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Ibata et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Ibata et al., Kobayashi, and Konoue et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 9.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 9 is allowable. Claims 10-18 depend upon Claim 9, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 9 is allowable.

Application No. 10/531,522
March 30, 2010
Reply to the Office Action dated January 5, 2010
Page 7 of 7

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 30, 2010

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710